IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.2868 OF 2006
IN
REVIEW PETITION (STAMP)NO.20302 OF 2006
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.3975 OF 2005

State of Maharashtra & Anr. ...Applicants.
Vs.
Shri Pandurang Tulshiram Kedare & Ors. ...Respondents.

....

Mr. V.A. Gangal, AGP for the Applicants.
Mr. R.K. Mendadkar for Respondent No.1.

.....

CORAM : SMT. RANJANA DESAI &
DR.D.Y.CHANDRACHUD, JJ.

January 17, 2007.

P.C.

The order of the Court of which a review has been sought was delivered on 5th August 2005. In the application for condonation of delay, it has been stated that the Review Petition was drafted by Special Counsel appointed by the State and was, in fact, duly affirmed by the Deputy Director and Member Secretary of the Caste Scrutiny Committee on 21st October 2005. Though the Review Petition was verified on 21st October 2005, it has been stated that the actual filing of the Review Petition remained to be done through over sight. We have perused the application for

condonation and the reply filed to oppose the application. The judgments of the Supreme Court in **Bihar State Road Transport Corporation vs. Presenting Officer, Industrial Tribunal**,[1] and **Nandi Verdhan Jain vs. Chander Kanta Jain**,[2] on which reliance has been placed by the Respondents, hold that the delay has to be satisfactorily explained. In the present case we are satisfied that sufficient cause has been shown and the delay has been duly explained. The Civil Application is made absolute in terms of prayer clause (a).

(SMT.RANJANA DESAI, J.)

(DR.D. Y. CHANDRACHUD, J.)

1 (2001) 9 SCC 691
2 (2002) 9 SCC 471